

Water Policy Technical Advisory Committee  
Meeting of July 14, 2003  
9 AM - 4 PM

Attendance:

Water Policy Technical Advisory Committee Members:

John Carlock, VAPDC alternate  
Robert Taylor, VDH  
Tom Botkins, VMA  
Mike Thacker, AEP  
Shelton Miles, CPR  
Frank Sanders, City of Winchester  
Bob Burnley, DEQ  
Judy K. Dunscomb, The Nature Conservancy  
Terry Reid, VAWWA  
Guy Aydlett, VAMWA  
Cathy Taylor, Dominion  
Mike West, HBAV  
Brian Ramaley, Newport News Water Works

Eldon James, RRBC  
Patti Jackson, James River Association  
Sam Hamilton, VA. Agribusiness Council  
Art Petrini, Henrico County  
Jesse Richardson, VAPA  
Charlie Crowder, Fairfax County Water Authority  
William E. Cox, Virginia Tech  
Ed Imhoff  
Jerry Higgins, Blacksburg, Christiansburg, VPI Water Authority  
Robert Royall, VA. Water Well Association  
Jeffery Irving, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Josh Rubinstein, VA. Rural Water Association

Members Absent:

Robert Conner, Brunswick County  
Christopher Miller, Piedmont Environmental Council  
William Stoneman, VA. Farm Bureau

Ward Staubitz, USGS  
David Paylor, Deputy SNR

DEQ and Facilitation staff:

Terry Wagner  
Kathy Frahm  
Joe Hassell  
Ellen Gillinsky

Barbara Hulburt  
Mark Rubin  
Bill Ellis

Interested Parties:

John Kauffman, DGIF  
David Kovacs, VAPA alternate  
Becky Mitchell, City of Virginia Beach  
John Lain, AWWA  
Alisia Penn, City of Richmond  
Larry Land, VACO

Denise Thompson, VML  
Kate Quinlan, VML  
Kristen Lentz, City of Norfolk  
Christopher Pomeroy, VAMWA alternate  
Paul Jacobs, Christian & Barton  
Clayton Walton, Williams Mullen  
Ray Jackson, WWAC  
Tom Roberts, VMA alternate

Summary of Meeting:

The minutes of the last TAC meeting were reviewed and no objections were raised.

Copies of the flip chart notes from the last two meetings of small group #1 were distributed. Eldon James, reporter for small group #1, then reviewed the substance of the meetings. It was suggested that new information comes available regularly on water quality issues and that any planning effort should be designed to consider such information as it becomes available. It was noted that the lack of data on water resources is pervasive and that there is a lack of diversity of the data. There is good data on ground water from I-95 east but very little data on ground water from I-95 west. Consequently, not all jurisdictions are starting from the same place in being able to inventory resources as part of a plan. This was acknowledged but it was suggested that this should not be an obstacle to continuing the planning effort.

Robert Royall reported on the Water Well Association's study of data in conjunction with James Madison University. Efforts are being made to collect data from well drillers across the state and the University is moving

forward with analyzing this data for the Shenandoah Valley.

Art Petrini reviewed the minutes of the recent meeting of small group #2 which were distributed to the group. The group is working on a model table of contents for a water supply plan for localities and regions.

John Carlock reviewed the minutes of the recent meeting of small group #3. One of the topics reviewed was whether the state (DEQ) could or should act as an advocate of projects resulting from planning efforts. A significant discussion arose around the meaning of “advocacy”. Members of group 3 indicated that the discussions centered around efforts by DEQ to serve as a facilitator of differences between plans, as an ombudsman to assist in navigating the regulatory process and as a coordinator of the various agencies’ permitting processes. In addition, there is a desire by localities for DEQ to serve as a proponent of a project once it has met stringent requirements set by DEQ for plans. Concerns about DEQ’s role as a proponent were voiced based on a perceived conflict between the planning and regulatory role of DEQ. Questions were raised about who DEQ would be representing in its role as a proponent. Issues were also raised concerning the diversity in resources available among jurisdictions to meet stringent requirements of a planning process. Small group #3 was asked to look at this issue again in light of the discussion and to seek alternatives to the term “advocacy”.

It was noted that the general assumption has been that the planning unit would be counties, cities or some combination of these entities (region). A question was raised about whether there was a methodology to incorporate river basin planning into this process through river basin commissions.

Tracy Kammer Goldberg of Fairfax and Ron Harris of Newport News then utilized a power point presentation to educate the group on issues surrounding safe yield. They covered the issues of safe yield calculations, reliability/risk, and demand forecasting. Their presentation focused on safe yield in relation to surface water. The transcribed power point presentation is attached hereto. Terry Wagner then provided insight into safe yield determinations for ground water. In summary, he indicated that it is very difficult to determine safe yield for ground water.

The facilitator then reviewed the goal of the TAC, which is to determine what guidance DEQ will give to localities in regard to the planning process. The charge of the TAC is not to resolve all of the issues. It is to provide the considerations that localities must take into account, policies that need to be decided and broad guidance as opposed to great detail.

The full TAC then divided into small group discussions for the remainder of the meeting.